REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Final Official Action dated 21 September 2005.

The allowance of Claims 21 – 25, if rewritten into independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, is hereby acknowledged. Accordingly, a new independent Claim 26 containing the subject matter of Claims 14, 20, and 21, has been introduced in the case, and new Claims 27 – 30 dependent upon Claim 26, have been introduced as well. It is believed that new Claims 26 – 30 containing the allowable subject matter of Claims 14, 20 and 21 – 25 are allowable; and the same is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 2, 7 – 12 and 14 – 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker et al., U.S. Patent 6,712,481. Responsive to the rejections made by the Examiner in the Official Action, Independent Claims 1 and 14 have been amended and are now clearer in their respective recitations which emphasize the distinguishing features of the present invention over the cited prior art.

Parker et al., the reference cited by the Examiner, discloses a light emitting panel assembly which includes reflection portions 12 with reflection face 15, a light input surface 19, slots 16 in the reflection portions 12, and light emitting members 3 in the slots 16.

It is respectfully submitted that Parker et al. fails to suggest, disclose or render obvious the structure which Applicant regards as the invention. Particularly, as best shown in Figures 3 and 12 of prior art Patent, each reflection portion 12 is provided with its own source of light 3. The light from each source of light is reflected by the reflective surfaces of the respective reflection portion 12. The geometry of each reflection portion 12 is selected to reflect the light of the light source received therein, e.g. within the reflection portion 12 corresponding to the light source in question and separately from the light beams emanating from other light sources in adjacent reflection portion as best shown in Figure 12. It is clear, therefore, that separate light beams from each light source within a respective reflection portion 12 are transmitted to the light guide. This arrangement is deficient due to the fact that it lacks light flux uniformity due to possible deviation between the optical characteristics of the plurality of the light sources used in Parker et al.

In the present invention, there is a single light source 5 for a plurality (at least a pair) of the reflection faces which are connected each to the other as shown in Figures 2A and 3B – 5. Since the light source in the arrangement of the present invention is the same for all reflection faces 21 there is no difference between the characteristics of the produced light beams and the flux reflected by each reflection face which is highly uniform in the present guidelight plate. Therefore, in contrast to Parker et al., in which characteristics of the light beams from different light sources may deviate one from another, the arrangement of the present invention enjoys a high uniformity of the overall illumination of the novel light inverse type guidelight plate.

Further, in Parker et al., in contrast to the present invention, the light sources are positioned in the slots 16 which are displaced from the light input surface 19 and towards the reflection faces 15 of the reflection portions 12. Such an arrangement is deficient in preventing utilization of the entire light power emanated from the light source due to insufficient light way from the light source to the reflection face 15.

Opposingly, in the present invention, the light member 5 is positioned at the transmitting face 22 and separated from the reflecting members 3 of the reflection face 21 which is sufficient to accommodate the full power of the lighting member 5 so that the light emanating from the lighting member 5 is not restricted in its path to the reflecting member 3. It is clear to those skilled in the art, that the arrangement of the present invention permits the utilization of the entire light flux emanated from the lighting member 5, thus providing for a highly efficient reverse lighting structure as compared to Parker et al. where only a portion of the light emanating from each light source can be reflected in each respective reflection portion 12 thereof.

Claim 1 has been amended to clearly emphasize the following features of the present invention:

"... at least one reflection portion having at least a first and second arc-shaped reflection faces ..."

"... a transmitting face connected to said first arc-shaped reflection face at said first end thereof and to said second arc-shaped reflection face at said second end thereof, said transmitting face including a single concave slot formed thereat, a lighting member being received in said single concave slot, wherein said at least first and second arc-shaped reflection faces of said at least one reflection portion are arranged with a single lighting member received in said single concave slot, said single lighting member emitting light to said at least first and second arc-shaped reflection faces to be reflected therefrom...".

Similarly, independent Claim 14 has been amended to clearly emphasize the following features (inter alia) of the present invention:

"... at least one reflecting portion having at least a pair of reflection faces ..."

"... the transmitting face having formed thereon a slot for receiving a corresponding lighting member ..."

"... a lighting member disposed in said slot, wherein light emitted by the lighting member faces said at least a pair of reflection faces ..."

"... the lighting member being disposed in the slot so that the confined light is directed toward said at least a pair of reflection faces ..."

These features are missing from the cited prior art Parker et al. reference. Accordingly, as Parker et al. fails to disclose each and every one of the claimed elements, it is not believed to anticipate the invention of the subject Patent Application as now claimed. Moreover, the Parker reference is not believed to make the combination of elements of the present invention obvious to one skilled in the art since the combination of the elements of the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed in Claims 1 and 14, provides for purposes and objectives not seen in Parker et al. Therefore, the allowance of Claims 1 and 14 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 7 - 12, dependent upon Claim 1, and Claims 15 - 25, dependent upon Claim 14, are believed each to add further limitations that are patentably distinct in addition to be dependent upon what is now believed to be patentable base claim, and therefore, allowable for at least the same reasons.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

This Amendment adds five (5) claims above that which was included in the original filing fees, and therefore, additional filing fees of $125.00 are due. The Director of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to charge the additional filing fee of $125.00, and any further fees necessary in this filing, to Deposit Account #18-2011.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

David I. Klein

David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 17 Jan. 2006

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Art Unit #2875, at (571) 273–8300, on the date shown below.

For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

David I. Klein
DAVID I. KLEIN

1/17/2006
Date